

SOUTH DAKOTA DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

NEXT GENERATION ACCOUNTABILITY

Oct. 26, 2011, 1-7 p.m.

Oct. 27, 2011, 8 a.m.-3 p.m.

PIERRE, SOUTH DAKOTA

1. Welcome - Dr. Melody Schopp
2. Review task force objectives:
 - a. Review existing accountability system for South Dakota and determine strengths and weaknesses
 - b. Study characteristics of existing accountability systems that could be implemented in South Dakota
 - c. Develop an improved accountability system for South Dakota that will be approved by the US Department of Education
3. Follow-up from September Task Force Meeting
 - a. Discussion of Longitudinal Data System – Tami Darnall, DOE
 - b. Discussion of Danielson Framework – Melody Schopp, DOE
 - c. Discussion of Growth Models - Lennie Symes, TIE
4. Review of US DOE Flexibility/Waiver Application Requirements and Process – Mary Stadick Smith, DOE
5. Next Generation Accountability – A National Perspective – Kirsten Taylor, CCSSO
6. Small Group Work - The Rubber Meets the Road
 - a. Group 1 - Annual Measurable Objectives - Achievement targets
States have three options for creating academic achievement goals. Need to determine which is best for SD. Some guiding questions:
 - i. Should a growth model be incorporated in our plan?
 - ii. If so, what are the key characteristics of the growth model? (fall to spring, spring to spring, other options?)
 - iii. Do we limit accountability to reading and math?
 - iv. If other areas are considered (other content areas, etc.), how should the factors be weighted?
 - v. Should AMOs differ by LEA, school or subgroup?
 - vi. What level should a school and/or district achieve in order to avoid the priority/focus list?
 - b. Group 2 – Standards and Assessment
The flexibility guidelines still require assessments in grades 3 - 8 and one high school grade. Some guiding questions:
 - i. Should our plan include an expansion beyond grades 3 - 8?
 - ii. Should we expand our system beyond Math and English/Language Arts?

- iii. Should formative assessments be included in our new system? If so, how should the results be used?
 - iv. What can we do to make high school assessment meaningful?
 - v. What assessments should be used in our proposed accountability system?
 - vi. Other factors that need to be considered are:
 - i. Alternative assessments – Special Education
 - ii. ELL assessments
 - c. Group 3 - Criteria for Reward Schools
Schools in improvement have been eliminated. The new terms are Priority, Focus and Reward schools. Some guiding questions:
 - i. How should Reward schools be identified?
 - ii. Should there be a difference between Title I Reward schools and non-Title I Reward schools?
 - iii. Should there be a “cap” on the number of Reward schools?
 - iv. What rewards/recognition should a Reward school receive?
 - v. What, if any, flexibility do we have as a state for identifying and working with Priority and Focus schools? What should that support system look like?
 - d. Group 4 - Teacher and Principal Evaluation
State guidelines related to teacher and principal evaluation and support must be created. Some guiding questions:
 - i. How should teacher performance be measured? (student growth, portfolios, parent surveys, others?)
 - ii. How do we incorporate teachers in areas where assessment not available?
 - iii. How should the various factors be weighted?
 - iv. How should principal performance be measured?
 - v. How should the proposed process be filtered through the teacher and principal groups in South Dakota?
7. Report from Small Groups – 10:00 am – 10/27
 8. Review progress of task force and set objectives/activities for next task force meeting – November 30 & December 1.
 9. Safe Travels!